UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Monday, 16 November 1992
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. SUH (Vice-Chairman)	(Republic of Korea)

CONTENTS

- Action on draft resolutions under all disarmament items

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61865 2804V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.34
21 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 65, 68 AND 142 (continued)

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 2 (A/C.1/47/L.31/Rev.1), cluster 4 (A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 and A/C.1/47/L.38) and cluster 5 (A/C.1/47/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/47/L.32). For technical reasons, action will not be taken today on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.13/Rev.1 in cluster 4.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on draft resolutions.

With respect to cluster 2, I call on the representative of Australia for an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31.

Mr. NEUHAUS (Australia): Australia would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31/Rev.1, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". Australia will again abstain on this draft resolution. As States are aware, Australia has sought to play a constructive and active role in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, to which the draft resolution refers. At its session this year we pressed hard for the Ad Hoc Committee to consider new approaches to achieving security and cooperation in the Indian Ocean taking into account the changing international situation. We are pleased to see in the draft resolution a request that the Ad Hoc Committee consider new approaches in the future.

However, the draft resolution is still mired in the old thinking and language, which refer to a different era and which have prevented progress on this matter in the Ad Hoc Committee for so many years. We, with others, have made strenuous efforts to have changes made to the draft resolution that would overcome these problems. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to achieve a consensus on such changes. For those reasons Australia will continue this year to abstain on the draft resolution on the Indian Ocean.

We hope, however, that the opportunity will be taken at the next session of the Ad Hoc Committee to build a consensus on the basis of a completely new approach to security and cooperation in the Indian Ocean. We also thank the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, the representative of Sri Lanka, for the efforts he has made to move the Committee in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31/Rev.1, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace". A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31/Rev.1, the programme budget implications of which are set out in document A/C.1/47/L.49. The draft resolution was submitted by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted by 98 votes to 3, with 31 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently the delegation of Kenya advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Spain had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): My delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.31/Rev.1, on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, as we have done every year with respect to similar draft resolutions since they were first introduced.

A large measure of our collective work here is to build a peaceful world based on the foundations of security, balance, sovereignty and guaranteed freedoms, including the freedom of navigation and the freedom of overflight. But this draft resolution and the conference it proposes would suggest that international law be modified, not to guarantee the continued freedoms of navigation and overflight but to erode them. As we look to recent history in the Persian Gulf and to history being written today in the Horn of Africa, we can see instances where the continued freedoms of navigation and overflight are essential to the maintenance of world peace. It is important that those freedoms be preserved.

My delegation cannot support a draft resolution which would compromose those freedoms and permit the establishment of a checkerboard of zones where navies and military aircraft may or may not move freely. That would only constrain our collective efforts in the pursuit of peace.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolutions in cluster 4. I call first on representatives wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. EKWALL (Sweden): On behalf of the Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden - I have asked to speak in order to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, "Israeli nuclear armament". The Nordic countries attach great importance to the on-going peace process in the Middle East, and it is our sincere hope that it will eventually bring much-needed peace and security to this tormented region. The Nordic countries welcome, inter alia, the fact that arms control issues are now being discussed at the multilateral level of this process. It is imperative that all parties concerned contribute to the peace process. A positive atmosphere conducive to further progress is essential. Suspicions and accusations must give way to good will and cooperation. Regrettably, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 does not fulfil these expectations. The question of non-proliferation is a central element in international efforts aimed at peace and security. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) constitutes a cornerstone with respect to non-proliferation of such weapons. The Nordic Governments urge all States that have not yet done so to accede to the NPT without further delay and to conclude full-scope safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). However, the text of the draft resolution fails to take into account recent developments in the nuclear field, particularly the fact that South Africa has acceded to the NPT and concluded a full-scope safeguards agreement with IAEA. The Nordic countries are therefore not in a position to support the draft resolution and will abstain when the text is put to the vote.

Ms. HERZL (Israel): Once again this Committee is debating a draft resolution - A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 - that should not have been on its agenda at all, either in title or in substance. This year more than ever before, this draft resolution is not in tune with developments that have occurred both on

(Ms. Herzl, Israel)

the international scene in general and in the Middle East in particular. The world has seen many dramatic changes in recent years. A new environment of cooperation and dialogue now exists and the Middle East will, we hope, benefit from these developments. The peace process begun in Madrid represents a concerted effort to address all bilateral and regional issues. This process is gaining ground and deserves encouragement from all parties, regional and extraregional alike. Due recognition of this process was shown by the Secretary-General in his recent report on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, which states:

> "The ongoing peace initiative on the Middle East offers a window of opportunity in the process of resolving the overall situation in the region. The Secretary-General earnestly hopes that the efforts of all those involved will be rewarded with positive results." (A/47/387, para. 5)

At the 36th General Conference of IAEA, which concluded a few weeks ago, the Agency resolved to discontinue any further reference to a resolution on Israeli nuclear capabilities and threats with a similar scope. In our view, it is in the interests of the United Nations that the General Assembly be inspired by the example of the General Conference of IAEA and invite Israel to have faith in the equitable nature of its dispositions.

The war in the Gulf demonstrated starkly that it was not Israel that constituted a threat to the region. Indeed, Israel does not threaten any State. At the time, Iraq successfully sponsored this draft resolution, diverting attention to a non-existent threat. It is in the face of such threats that in the past 11 years Israel has been proposing to establish in due course a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East based on free and

(Ms. Herzl, Israel)

direct negotiations. Today this issue can be addressed in the working group on regional security and arms control within the framework of the multilateral talks on the Middle East. For this reason, yet another debate on this resolution in total disregard for the peace process constitutes yet another primitive ritual which is bound to cast doubt on the sincerity of the United Nations. Adoption of this draft resolution will not contribute to the ongoing peace process.

We hope that those parties from outside the region will take part in the multilateral peace talks and act accordingly, on the basis of a realistic and constructive approach, and that as we suggested, item 64 of the agenda, on Israeli nuclear armaments, should be struck from the agenda altogether, title and content, or be voted against. If the General Assembly musters a majority in favour of any resolution under this title, Israel must conclude that the General Assembly disregards the Middle East peace process - under which all subjects pertaining to peace in the Middle East will be taken up in due course - and is insisting on continuing to criticize Israel unreservedly.

Mrs. LAOSE-AJAYI (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev. 1, "Israeli nuclear armament", which we voted for in the past and intend to vote for again this year. Nigeria supports in broad terms the thrust of the draft resolution, which in our view should facilitate the accession of all States in the region to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Hence we would have preferred it if the text appealed to all States in the Middle East to sign the NPT and submit their nuclear facilities to full-scope safeguards inspection. The Nigerian delegation believes that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, has taken sufficient care of the concerns expressed in draft

(Mrs. Laose-Ajayi, Nigeria)

resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev. 1. Indeed, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 is not only balanced but moderately reflects current developments in the Middle East. We note with satisfaction that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 was adopted without a vote. Regrettably, the appeal in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 is addressed to only one State. Certainly, accession by one State in the Middle East region to the exclusion of others cannot promote the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. Furthermore, Nigeria believes that the draft resolution should have confined itself to issues relevant to the region. We appeal to all States in the Middle East to take advantage of the ongoing peace talks to promote a climate of confidence and reconciliation.

It is Nigeria's sincere hope that there will be no need to repeat draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 next year.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States has asked for the floor to explain its position before a vote is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, "Amendment to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". The United States, at the conclusion of the Amendment Conference on this Treaty in January 1991, stated that consideration of the proposed amendment had been completed with the conclusion of the Conference convened for that purpose. It is the view of the United States that there is no legal basis for any further sessions or work to be carried out under the auspices of the Amendment Conference. The United States has gone on record that it would neither participate in any further work on the amendment nor contribute to paying the costs for any additional meetings of the Amendment Conference.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

The United States remains fundamentally opposed to the proposal to amend the limited test-ban Treaty, to turn it into a comprehensive test-ban treaty and to the holding of any additional meetings of a conference that has already been concluded. Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 is inconsistent with the policy of the United States which will therefore vote against it.

Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): The draft resolution entitled "Israeli nuclear armament" (A/C.1/47/L.9) has been the subject of several amendments, which have diluted its content and substance that dealt with the gravity of the Israeli nuclear threat in the Middle East. My delegation would have liked to see the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 much more strongly phrased. For these reasons, my delegation withdraws from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution though it will vote for it.

Mr. AL-NASSER (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I had the honour of introducing the draft resolution on Israeli nuclear armament, in this Committee, on behalf of its sponsors, in its original version (A/C.1/47/L.9) which reflected the collective Arab position on this important issue and on its negative effects on Arab national security and the security of the Middle East region as a whole.

Now it is my pleasure to apprise the members of the First Committee of the fact that since that date, the Arab Group has spared no effort in contacting and consulting with all the delegations that wished to put forward, in a spirit of cooperation and understanding, proposals aimed at amending certain elements and provisions in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9.

In light of the foregoing, allow me to enunciate the amendments that have been agreed upon in response to the principal wishes of friendly delegations, which, we hope, will support this draft resolution, in the context of mutual concern with our common issues, on the one hand, and in response, on our part, to changing circumstances, on the ground, at the international and regional levels, on the other.

Consequently, preambular paragraphs 4, 8 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9 have been deleted, as has operative paragraph 4. Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9 has become preambular paragraph 7 and reads: "Concerned at the cooperation between Israel and South Africa in the military nuclear fields,". We have also deleted the last part of preambular paragraph 7, which now becomes preambular paragraph 6 in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 and reads: "Deeply alarmed by the information with regard to the continuing production, development and acquisition of nuclear weapons by Israel,". The phrase "that could enhance its

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

nuclear-weapons capability" in operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9 has been amended to read "with the aim of enhancing its nuclear-weapons capability" in what has become operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1.

Consequently, members of this important forum are urged to support the revised draft resolution which aims, in its objective substance, at ensuring collective security in accordance with international legality and the norms of international relations in a manner that would lead to the consolidation of security and stability in the region of the Middle East to the great benefit of all the peoples of the region.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, "Israeli nuclear armament", is to be taken by recorded vote. It was introduced by the representative of Qatar, at the 26th meeting of the First Committee and, taking into account the statement made at this meeting by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, is sponsored by the following countries: Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against: Israel, Romania, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 was adopted by 54 votes to 3, with 70 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38. Separate votes on operative paragraphs 1 and 2 have been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 is entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". I wish to point out that by the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.38, the General Assembly would, inter alia, note the ongoing consultations being conducted by the President of the Amendment Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty

(Mr. Kheradi)

Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and the special meeting of States Parties of a brief duration to be held in New York in the second quarter of 1993 to review the developments on the issue of nuclear testing, with a view to examining the feasibility of resuming the work of the Amendment Conference later that year.

(Mr. Kheradi)

It should be noted that the special meeting and the possible resumed Amendment Conference would be activities of States parties to the Treaty. As has been the case in the past, conferences and other meetings of multilateral disarmament treaties such as the Amendment Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, of January 1991, and the biological weapons Convention Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts to identify and examine potential verification measures from a scientific and technical standpoint have covered the related costs and no charges were made on the regular budget of the United Nations. It is the understanding of the Secretary-General that the special meeting of States parties to the Treaty envisaged in the draft resolution would be scheduled in close consultation with the Office of Conference Services in order to ensure that the related requirements would not give rise to additional costs to the Organization.

In addition, should a decision be made by States parties at the special meeting to resume the Amendment Conference later in 1993 it is the Secretary-General's understanding that the cost of required assistance or services would not be a charge on the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs of holding the Conference would have to be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the parties to the Treaty.

As you stated earlier, Mr. Chairman, separate recorded votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, and with your permission I shall now proceed to conduct the voting as specified. The Committee will vote first on operative paragraph 1 of that draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 was adopted by 86 votes to 2, with 43 abstentions.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 41 abstentions.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, as a whole, was adopted by 93 votes to 2, with 40 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their positions on all the draft resolutions adopted in cluster 4.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): The European Community and its member States have collectively abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1. They agree that Israel should put all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. But they disagree that such a call should be focused exclusively on Israel; there are other States that have not yet placed all their facilities under IAEA safeguards. The Community and its member States have made their views known on this repeatedly. We dislike this singling out - even more so now that the parties are seriously engaged in the Middle East peace process.*

We believe that the peace process, which offers interested parties the possibility of a direct dialogue, is an appropriate mechanism by which to further disarmament in the Middle East. All States should appreciate the delicacy of this process. They should exercise restraint and refrain from throwing accusations at one another. Instead they should cooperate and show the necessary political will to discuss all items of common interest.

The Community and its member States note that at the General Conference of IAEA in Vienna in September it was generally felt that in view of the peace process already under way in the Middle East, the aim of which was to conclude a comprehensive and just peace in the region, and which included in particular discussions on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, it would be desirable not to consider the agenda item entitled "Israeli nuclear capabilities and threat". We regret that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 were unwilling to consider the suggestion that they should agree to similar action in the Committee.

---

* Mr. Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The Community and its member States support efforts to achieve a Middle East free of nuclear weapons. To that end, they call on all States in the region to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to place all their nuclear facilities under full-scope IAEA safeguards. In this context, the Community and its member States recall their support for the initiative of President Mubarak to make the Middle East a zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

That should have been the message in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1.

Mr. ARAR (Turkey): I should like to explain briefly my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 concerning Israeli nuclear armament.

Turkey supported this draft resolution. By reason of its geographical location, Turkey attaches great importance to the preservation of peace and security in the Middle East. It believes that the search for a new security structure and new security measures in the Middle East with a view to the promotion of peace in the region is the responsibility of all the countries of the region and that progress towards that end will make a substantial contribution to the success of the Middle East peace process.

Turkey believes that nuclear facilities that are not placed under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards constitute a factor that inherently undermines the climate of confidence. That is why Turkey misses no opportunity to call not only on Israel but on all States in the region to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty and to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. For that reason, we should have preferred to have the draft resolution call on all States in the region to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Mr. SERGEEV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): The Russian delegation would like to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 and A/C.1/47/L.38.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, we should like to declare that Russia has consistently favoured strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and actively advocated the idea of universalizing the 1968 Treaty. We are convinced that if all Middle East States acceded to the non-proliferation Treaty, if their nuclear activities were put under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and if practical measures to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East were adopted, those steps would constitute an important contribution to achieving progress in the field of non-proliferation and to strengthening peace and international security.

Of course, much depends on the stance of Israel. We expect it to take concrete action, in consonance with the positive trends in the world with regard to the limititation and elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, we believe that the era of beneficial changes that mankind has now entered and the spirit of cooperation and interaction that is steadily growing stronger in international relations required us, the States Members of the United Nations, to be cautious and balanced in the decisions we take. We must overcome unjustified attitudes of confrontation, we must act on the basis of reciprocity and general agreement if we are to make progress. In our view, this is especially true today with regard to the Middle East, in connection with the development of a process of peaceful settlement in the region, which opens possibilities for real advances towards the resolution of one of the oldest conflicts of the twentieth century.

(Mr. Sergeev, Russian Federation)

In view of all this, the Russian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, as it did in the vote on the corresponding draft resolution last year.

In explaining the reasons for the Russian delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water", we should like to point out once again that Russia is ready to take advantage of every opportunity to achieve a total ban on nuclear testing. Recently President Yeltsin, speaking in the Parliament of the United Kingdom concerning the fact that Russia had extended its one-year moratorium to 1 July 1993, stressed that the moratorium could be extended further if future conditions were appropriate. He also expressed the hope that all countries would stop nuclear testing.

In view of our position of principle, and taking into account the generally positive thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 and many of its specific provisions with which we agree, the delegation of the Russian Federation supported the draft resolution as a whole.

However, we were compelled to ask for a separate vote on paragraphs 1 and 2, in which we abstained. Paragraph 1 refers as if it were an established fact to the idea that in the second quarter of 1993 there will be a special meeting of States parties to the Treaty, even though, as is known, States parties could not agree on that question during the consultations held at the beginning of this session. Those consultations also demonstrated that there is no consensus on the question whether the conditions necessary for resumption of the work of the Amendment Conference have been met. Thus we feel that the appeal to participate in that Conference, contained in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, does not seem entirely justified.

Ms. HERZL (Israel): It is regrettable that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 has been adopted by the First Committee and that such is the message that the Committee is sending to Israel.

We entertain no argument with our inveterate detractors, who will stop at nothing to stoke the fires of enmity. It is to be hoped that we shall be able to change their attitudes. However, we must register our deep sense of disappointment with all those States that expect to be actively involved in the peace process but, by their abstention, have made possible the adoption of a draft resolution that indicates a wish to see Israel subjected to punitive measures and an unwillingness to cooperate with it.

As representatives know, the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency was more forthcoming just a few weeks ago when it decided to dispose of a similar draft resolution. We cannot help feeling that considerations of an extraneous nature determined the voting stance of abstaining States that participated in the peace talks - that the convictions of those States were overridden by such considerations. This is not an unusual practice, but Israelis find it difficult to accept.

We hope that in future the spirit of the multilateral talks will prevail here too. To put it bluntly, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 contradicts the spirit and the purpose of the peace talks. The First Committee will come to realize that this draft resolution is the only thing that the Israeli public will retain of the Committee's message and of its attitude towards the peace talks and that, as Israel is a democracy, the perception of its public is something to be reckoned with.

Mr. CHIRILA (Romania) (interpretation from French): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, "Israeli nuclear armament".

We have great respect for the delegations that submitted this draft resolution and we share their concern regarding a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Romania is firm in its support for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and we take an active part in efforts to consolidate this regime at the global and regional levels. We are convinced that accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by the States in the Middle East that have not yet done so, the submission of all nuclear activities to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and the adoption of specific measures with a view to the establishment of a zone free of nuclear and any other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East: all these measures would greatly advance the objectives of non-proliferation and greatly strengthen international security in general. Here, of course, much depends on the position of each State in the region.

We welcome the fact that, this year, the Committee adopted the draft resolution - A/C.1/47/L.11 - on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East without a vote. We have noted that Israel is also in favour of creating such a zone. At the same time we believe that at this stage in international relations in which the spirit of cooperation and interaction is becoming ever stronger, what is required is that States Members of the United Nations choose and adopt measures that are carefully weighed and balanced. A similar approach, by the way, prevailed this year at the annual session of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

As we stressed at the past session, when the draft resolution on the same subject was considered in the First Committee, such an approach is particularly significant in the context of the Middle East, where efforts are under way to advance the process of peaceful settlement with prospects which, without being guaranteed or very encouraging, still offer some hope. The parties to the conflict in the Middle East must continue to enter into a dialogue and settle their problems, so that mutual condemnation may give way to mutual trust.

In our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 we are contributing to the promotion of new language, a dialogue aimed at creating a realistic, equitable, constructive and lasting settlement of the problems of the Middle East.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, "Israeli nuclear armament". In the past my delegation has supported resolutions on this subject because their basic thrust was directed against increased militarization. Our position on that matter remains unchanged.

This year's draft resolution - A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 - contains new language, in operative paragraph 2. It reads:

"Urges Israel to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

My delegation's principled stand on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is well known. Moreover, the singling out of one State on this issue is not appropriate. My delegation has therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. Indeed, if there had been a vote paragraph by paragraph, my delegation would have voted against operative paragraph 2.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

I would like to add that my delegation will continue to support all efforts aimed at the total elimination of all nuclear weapons through a global approach. My delegation remains fully committed, as in the past, to efforts aimed at building peace and security in the Middle East.

Ms. MOULES (Australia): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 and, on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38.

My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, on which we have a number of reservations. Australia has consistently tried to urge Israel and other States, both parties and non-parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to live up to the standards of international behaviour set forth in that Treaty. We call upon all States parties to the NPT to conclude the safeguards agreements with the Agency required by the Treaty. We appeal to the few remaining States not parties to the NPT, particularly those that operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to accede to the Treaty.

Similarly, Iraq's violation of its obligations under the NPT has been and remains a matter of continuing attention and concern. The past few years has seen a substantial improvement in the security climate in several parts of the world, including the Middle East where the peace process begun at Madrid has continued. Australia has been pleased to join in the arms control and disarmament forum under that process, focusing in particular on Middle East regional security and arms control issues. Therefore Australia has demonstrated interest in seeing well-balanced practical and constructive arms control proposals being endorsed for the Middle East region and more

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

generally. We regret, however, that resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 does not fit into this category. We consider that the selective focus on Israel does not contribute towards practical arms control and peacemaking. Australia's abstention should not, however, be interpreted as anything less than full and complete support for calls on Israel to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty and to accept full-scope safeguards on all its nuclear activities.

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, it is with regret that Australia and New Zealand abstained from voting on this draft resolution on the proposal concerning the Amendment Conference relating to the partial test-ban Treaty (PTBT). As all delegations will be aware, Australia and New Zealand attach great importance to the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We are among the original sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, which calls for the early achievement of a comprehensive treaty. Like most others, in the past we have been frustrated by the lack of progress on test-ban issues, and the 1991 Amendment Conference on the PTBT was a manifestation of that. For our part, we recognize the opportunity that the Amendment Conference provided for States to exchange views on test-ban issues on an equal footing, even if it was clear at the outset that the Conference could not achieve its stated goals.

We were obliged nevertheless to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, because we are convinced that the most appropriate and effective way to achieve a broadly supported, multilateral and comprehensive ban on testing is through the mechanism of negotiations conducted in the Conference on Disarmament. The prospects for advancing that goal in the Conference are now better than ever before. We recognize that questions concerning the need for enhanced participation by the members of the international community in that forum remain to be addressed. Nevertheless, as the achievement in 1992 of the chemical weapons Convention demonstrates, the Conference on Disarmament remains the body best equipped to pursue and achieve complex and politically sensitive disarmament objectives.

It is therefore with pleasure that our two Governments welcome the recent announcement by the Government of France that it intends to conduct discussions with other nuclear States on test-ban issues. We see such

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

discussions as an inescapable and important support mechanism for the work done in the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban in Geneva. In contrast, it is clear that not only would the Amendment Conference to the PTBT not encompass all nuclear States, it would also not be capable of engaging them in constructive dialogue.

Had the text of the draft resolution on the Amendment Conference been of a more procedural nature, simply noting the consultations that Foreign Minister Alatas of Indonesia had carried out in accordance with the decision adopted at the Conference, we would have been able to vote in favour of it. Regrettably, the inclusion of a number of elements and assumptions in the text, some of which I have referred to above, prevented us from doing so.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): Japan abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, which has just been adopted, and I would like to state the following for the record.

Japan welcomes the development of the peace process that is now under way and deeply appreciates the efforts made by the countries concerned. We sincerely hope that this process will never be jeopardized, but will be encouraged, so that it will reach a successful conclusion. In this respect, however, I am not sure whether this draft resolution will in fact help the atmosphere of the peace process. We believe that denuclearization of the region will contribute to the promotion of peace and stability in this region and in the world as well. Japan supports the efforts made by the States concerned with a view to realizing denuclearization of the region and urges the States that have not yet done so to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty as early as possible.

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

I should also like to explain Japan's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38. As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, Japan is very supportive of any efforts made by other countries towards achieving such a treaty. As for the Amendment Conference of the States Parties to the partial test-ban Treaty (PTBT), I should point out that, as not all nuclear-weapon countries are parties to the PTBT, the body best qualified to conduct discussions on a comprehensive test ban is the Conference on Disarmament, of which all nuclear-weapon States are members. Japan is of the view that we should not diffuse, but rather consolidate, our efforts to address the comprehensive test ban in the Conference on Disarmament through the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban next year.

Mr. EKWALL (Sweden): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

The position of Sweden on a nuclear-test ban is well known. Sweden has consistently advocated negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. My delegation has co-sponsored relevant resolutions in the First Committe and the General Assembly. My Government has also presented complete drafts of treaties in the Conference on Disarmament, the latest one in July 1991. My delegation is sympathetic to the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, since the aim is to promote the positive development of the test-ban issue. Sweden welcomes the consultations conducted by the President of the Amendment Conference of the partial test-ban Treaty. My delegation has taken an active part in these consultations. We hope that they will be brought to a successful conclusion.

(Mr. Ekwall, Sweden)

Nevertheless, Sweden abstained from voting on this draft resolution. The reason is that we consider that it is up to the States parties to the partial test-ban Treaty to agree on necessary measures with regard to possible amendments of the Treaty. We would therefore have preferred to see a draft resolution limited to addressing the consultations held out by the President of the Amendment Conference.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, "Israeli nuclear armament". Guided by the principle of non-acceptance of nuclear weapons as a means of warfare, and taking into consideration the need to adopt urgent international measures for their non-proliferation, reduction and liquidation, Ukraine has consistently lent its support to all international efforts aimed at the prevention of nuclear armaments in any country in respect of which there is reason to believe that it is in fact endeavouring to gain possession of nuclear means of destruction. The nuclear ambitions that keep some States out of the non-proliferation Treaty or prevent their implementation of this Treaty in good faith serve as a source of suspicion and tension. They do not contribute to strengthening stability and are not conducive to improved security of States.

At the same time, the discriminatory approach that is evident in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, and which reflects the bloc philosophy and confrontational atmosphere of the not-so-distant past - when many draft resolutions were submitted with a view, not to achieving practical results, but to gaining ideological dividends - led us to abstain from voting on this draft resolution.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukraine)

While sharing the anxiety of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1 on the substance of the matter, the Ukrainian delegation none the less abstained in the vote because of the discriminatory treatment of the problem by certain nuclear-capable States which refused to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Ms. MASON (Canada): As a country which abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9/Rev.1, and which is a participant in multilateral aspects of the Middle East peace process, Canada wishes to associate itself with the explanation of vote given by the Nordic countries before their abstention on that draft resolution.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38, on which Canada abstained notwithstanding our position as an original sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, we wish to associate our delegation with the explanations of vote just given by Australia on behalf of itself and New Zealand, by Japan and by Sweden. For similar reasons, Canada too was compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 5: A/C.1/47/L.15/Rev.1 and A/C.1/47/L.32. I call first on the representative of India.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): At an earlier meeting, my delegation had the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security". Similar texts have been submitted on behalf of the sponsors of this draft resolution since the forty-third session of the General Assembly; it covers a

(Mr. Chandra, India)

theme that should be of universal concern, as it pertains to the qualitative improvement of weapons and weapons systems and their impact on the global security environment, and to the need to channel scientific and technological development into measures to meet peaceful needs and benefit mankind.

The considerations underlying this draft resolution were spelt out by my delegation when it introduced the text earlier in this session. Draft resolutions on this subject received wide support at the forty-fourth and forty-fifth sessions of the General Assembly; it is our hope that the present draft resolution will continue to enjoy wide support when it is voted upon today. This would express the universality of concern within the First Committee on this important issue.

According to the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request a follow-up to the interim report of the Secretary-General (A/47/355) of 10 August 1992, which was prepared in pursuance of resolution 45/60.

We thank the delegations which have cooperated with us, and hope that the draft resolution will enjoy wide support.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15/Rev.1. I call on the Committee Secretary.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 28th meeting, held on 10 November 1992. It is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Spain, Samoa, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security", was introduced by the representative of India at the 28th meeting, held on 10 November 1992. It is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32 was adopted by 104 votes to 3, with 28 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their votes on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32, which has just been adopted.

Ms. MOULES (Australia): Australia has just supported draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security". We wish to register our view, however, that it should not automatically be assumed that technological advances which are applied to military purposes would necessarily have a negative impact on the security environment. Australia believes that such advances can also contribute positively to international security.

Mr. KONIK (Poland): I would like to explain the vote of the delegation of Poland on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security". My delegation abstained on this draft resolution on the following grounds.

First, scientific and technological development is in itself neutral, and it is only the application of the research in that field that may have positive or negative effects. This was recognized in fact by the Disarmament Commission in its report (A/47/42). In our opinion, the draft resolution just adopted tends to overestimate the negative aspects of the question and their impact on international security, especially in the new international environment free from bloc-to-bloc confrontation.

Secondly, it is evident from the report of the Secretary-General on the subject (A/47/355) that assessment of the impact of scientific and technological developments is an extremely complex task and as such requires considerable human and financial resources. We are not sure whether it would be fair to engage the limited resources of the Office for Disarmament Affairs in implementation of such a demanding task, without at the same time envisaging the proper reinforcement of the Office.

(Mr. Konik, Poland)

Finally, we prefer the approach taken by the authors of the draft resolution on a similar subject, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15/Rev.1, on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields. As both subjects are considered in the same working group of the Disarmament Commission, we would have preferred to see the two questions reflected in a single, merged draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now completed its work on cluster 5.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.